

Lead Entity Advisory Group
January 20, 2006
Washington State Criminal Justice Training Center
Burien, WA 98148
Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:	<p>Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Tribe Jeff Breckel, Lower Columbia Fish Recovery Board Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Jay Watson, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Melissa Paulson, WDFW Tim Smith, WDFW John Sims, Quinault Nation Rollie Geppert, IAC/SRFB Neil Aaland, IAC/SRFB Steve Martin, Snake River Salmon Recovery Board Mary Jorgenson, WRIA 8 Barbara Rosenkotter, San Juan County Bret Nine, Pend Oreille CD Paul Dorn, Squamish Tribe, WRIA 14 Kim Bredensteiner, Island County Amy Hatch-Winecka, WRIAs 13 & 14 Lee Napier, Grays Harbor County Selinda Barkhuis, NOPL Debby Hyde, Pierce County Dan Wrye, Pierce County Roy Huberd, Pierce County Steve Tharinger, SRFB Gary Cooper, IAC Jim Fox, IAC Chris Drivdahl, GSRO</p>
WDFW Report	<p>WDFW has filled the Lead Entity/Watershed Steward Coordinator position. Lauri Vigue will begin in her new capacity within the next two weeks. WDFW staff are excited to welcome Laurie to the position and are confident in her abilities.</p> <p>Marnie Tyler will be ending her tenure as Salmon Recovery Coordinator at the end of January. The Habitat Work Schedule project will swing into full gear once her replacement has been selected.</p> <p>DFW has three requests currently pending before the Legislature related to LE's. The first is the Habitat Work Schedule project. The Governor's proposed FY 06 supplemental budget includes authorization for the expenditure of \$700k of federal funds for the project. The second is in the Governor's capital budget request, creating the Estuary and Salmon Recovery program. \$2.5 would be available for projects benefiting salmon in Puget Sound estuaries. The projects would be consistent with the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership, and approved by the Partnership Executive Committee. Finally, the Governor's proposed operating budget includes \$550k for the Office of Regulatory Assistance (ORA). Funds would be used, in part, to support</p>

	<p>piloting approaches to identify priority "alternative mitigation" opportunities, including those identified in salmon recovery plans.</p>
<p>SRFB 7th Round Discussion – IAC/SRFB</p>	<p>Neil Aaland opened the discussion of SRFB 7th Round issues by identifying two primary concerns: 1) Specifics regarding the upcoming grant round (type?, timing?); 2) Issues related to the long-term process (Issues Task Force process). He presented some options for 7th Round 2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) Regular funding round, with same timing as 2005 B) Phased grant round on 18-month timeframe; initial allocation 12/06 & final allocation June 2007 C) Use of some permutation of existing project lists for 7th Round D) In combination w/(B), use 6th Round 1st Increment guidelines for funding <p>Further, Neil identified other concerns to be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Certainty 2) Regional Plans/Boards – how do these fit into the process? 3) Timing constraint – specifically, the legislative session one year from now. 4) Lead Entity strategies – will these be considered as part of future funding, or not? 5) Technical Review Panels – how/if to use them in the future. <p>Finally, Neil relayed the schedule for IAC/SRFB "next steps": <u>February 10, 2006, ITF Information Gathering Meeting</u> – This would be a third opportunity for lead entities and others to express concerns directly to the ITF. <u>Post-February 10, 2006, SRFB debriefing</u> – SRFB will seek direction for the immediate grant round, as well as ITF focus issues.</p>
<p>SRFB 7th Round Discussion – WDFW</p>	<p>Tim Smith identified three primary issues of concern to WDFW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Watershed LEs vs. Region LEs – What is most equitable, and how do we get there? HB 2496 language maintains that decisions should be made as close to the watershed level as possible. 2) ESA vs. Health stocks/populations – Also, ESUs vs. broader considerations. How do we avoid "punishing" lead entities for having non-listed stocks? This issue is also important when considering application of federal vs. state funding. 3) Science of Salmon vs. Community Values – Where do you set priorities when these two value sets do not line up? "Feel good" projects (see below: GSRO) often have a great deal of value to the local process.
<p>SRFB 7th Round Discussion – GSRO</p>	<p>Chris Drivdahl brought up a few potential concerns for consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There is a strong need to clearly show the relationship of projects to regional plans. Specifically, does the plan explicitly guide priorities within the region? 2) There has been criticism that SRFB is funding "feel good" projects (with poor scientific merit) for political purposes and without regional guidance.
<p>SRFB 7th Round Discussion – LEAG & Lead Entities</p>	<p>Lead Entity Coordinators, LEAG members, and others in attendance identified questions and concerns about the current SRFB funding process: (Line items appearing in bold typeface were reiterated multiple times.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uncertainty of funding ○ Appropriate role of planning regions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Desire to avoid leaving funds on the table at the end of the year ○ Maintenance of engaged citizens committees ○ How do those lead entities NOT in planning regions fit into the process? ○ Phased approach seems sound – it would provide the opportunity for ITF (in cooperation with input from LEs) to fix some issues. ○ Current SRFB process is long/complex, with little return. ○ A “disconnect” between Citizen and Technical groups caused problems with SRFB reviews. ○ Strong desire to examine/resolve issues now and move forward. ○ Frustration with SRFB technical review panel process – local prioritization processes are not often transparent; lack of communication was also an issue; could we do with a regional review panel instead? ○ Some lead entities would want to have the chance to create a good, short list of 2006 projects. ○ A “mini round” would still be “full work” for lead entities. ○ Desire for “7th Round 2006 and 8th Round 2007” over an 18 month round. ○ Concern that SRFB funding criteria should be set in advance of application process. ○ The first phase of a “phased funding option” would really need to be simple, allowing time for LEs to participate in the ITF process. ○ There is a need to know the criteria for a “mini” or “phased” round before making a decision on which is preferable. A mini round process concurrent w/ITF process is too idealistic. ○ Great concern about process being clear in the future – want to avoid moving to a poor process. ○ Some LEs oppose an interim/mini round process, viewing it as nonproductive. ○ Technical Review Panel process was helpful, generally good. ○ Support for doing 7th Round like 6th Round and fixing issues for 8th Round; phasing would cause loss of momentum. ○ Criteria for regional lists for 2007 should be clear ○ Appropriate relationship and representation of CAG/TAG chairs to regional board
SRFB 7th Round Discussion – Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Don’t solve all issues at once. ○ Take a step within the current round and figure out regional allocations and funding targets. ○ Push regions to submit prioritized lists. ○ Mini-round without the SRFB Technical Review Panel Process? ○ Five Principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Predictability in funding 2) More certain and brief process with less external review 3) Maintain local practices 4) Funding supports equivalent level of effort for the recovery of all listed ESUs (habitat focus). 5) Strategic approach is necessary.

Items for Future Attention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Meeting of Puget Sound lead entities regarding PS Nearshore Restoration with Implementation Team ○ For 2/10/06 meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define “equivalent level of effort” for ESU • Identify other sources of funds • Develop a funding cycle to allocate funds in 2006 – must commence by 5/06 and move toward reform of issues. ○ WDFW staff will solicit and compile information from all lead entities regarding concerns about participation in 7th Round funding cycle.
NEXT MEETING	Not Yet Scheduled